

APPENDIX D QASP METRICS

D-1. General. The following appendix provides: (1) instructions for developing performance metrics; (2) a blank table for a QASP Performance Metrics Table for Performance Assessment Record (PAR); and (3) a sample QASP Performance Metrics Table that was completed for a particular project.

D-2. Instructions.

a. The PPIMS is the Army's central repository for the collection and utilization of Army-wide contractor Past Performance Information (PPI). Available to authorized Government personnel, PPIMS is used to support both the Contracting Performance Review process and future award decisions. For further information on PPIMS go to:
<https://apps.altess.army.mil/ppims/prod/ppimshp.cfm>

b. Performance metrics are developed for each project to assure project objectives are met and as a basis for periodically evaluating contractor performance using the PAR in the PPIMS.

c. The primary PAR Categories evaluated in PPIMS are identified in the table below. Other categories may be utilized if deemed necessary by the project team.

d. Each Definable Feature of Work identified in the Surveillance Activity Table, Column 1, will have at least one performance metric associated with it. Also, more than one Definable Feature of Work can be evaluated within a given PAR Category. For example: the overall rating given the contractor for the PAR Category "Quality of Product or Service" will most likely be a combination of ratings of different Definable Features of Work, such as Draft Work Plan Quality, QC Plan Execution, Regulatory or Process Compliance, etc. However, each of these Definable Features of Work has their own Basic Performance Indicators (Column 7 of the Surveillance Activities Table). The contractor may receive a "Marginal" for Draft Work Plan Quality, an "Exceptional" for QC Plan Execution, and a "Satisfactory" for Regulatory Compliance, which may translate to an overall rating of "Very Good" for the PAR Category of "Quality of Product or Service."

EM 1110-1-4009
15 Jun 07

Table D-1. QASP Performance Metrics for Performance Assessment Record (PAR) –
Blank Table

Note:

	Exceptional	Very Good	Satisfactory	Marginal	Unsatisfactory
PAR Category: Quality of Product or Service <i>(See Column 6 of Surveillance Activities Table)</i>					
Performance Indicator <i>(See Column 7 of Surveillance Activities Table)</i>					
PAR Category: Schedule <i>(See Column 6 of Surveillance Activities Table)</i>					
Performance Indicator <i>(See Column 7 of Surveillance Activities Table)</i>					
PAR Category: Cost Control <i>(See Column 6 of Surveillance Activities Table)</i>					
Performance Indicator <i>(See Column 7 of Surveillance Activities Table)</i>					
PAR Category: Business Relations <i>(See Column 6 of Surveillance Activities Table)</i>					
Performance Indicator <i>(See Column 7 of Surveillance Activities Table)</i>					
PAR Category: Management of Key Personnel and Resources <i>(See Column 6 of Surveillance Activities Table)</i>					
Performance Indicator <i>(See Column 7 of Surveillance Activities Table)</i>					
PAR Category: Safety <i>(See Column 6 of Surveillance Activities Table)</i>					
Performance Indicator <i>(See Column 7 of Surveillance Activities Table)</i>					

*From Section C of Basic contract #W111WW-11-W-0000, Amendment 0001 (may be included, but are not limited to these)

The following guidelines are provided for issuing ratings that are subjective in nature; these ratings will be supported by the weight of evidence documented during the government's surveillance efforts. Note: These adjectival ratings are defined in the PPIMS.

Exceptional: Performance *meets* contractual requirements and *exceeds many* to the Government's benefit. The contractual performance of the element or sub-element being assessed was accomplished with *few minor problems* for which corrective actions taken by the contractor were *highly effective*.

Very Good: Performance *meets* contractual requirements and *exceeds some* to the Government's benefit. The contractual performance of the element or sub-element being assessed was accomplished with *some minor problems* for which corrective actions taken by the contractor were *effective*.

Satisfactory: Performance *meets* contractual requirements. The contractual performance of the element or sub-element contains *some minor problems* for which corrective actions taken by the contractor *appear or were satisfactory*.

Marginal: Performance *does not meet all* contractual requirements. The contractual performance of the element or sub-element being assessed reflects a *serious problem* for which the contractor has *not yet identified corrective actions*. The contractor's proposed actions appear only *marginally effective or were not fully implemented*.

Unsatisfactory: Performance *does not meet most* contractual requirements and *recovery is not likely* in a timely manner. The contractual performance of the element or sub-element contains *serious problems* for which the contractor's corrective actions *appear or were ineffective*.

Table D-2. QASP Performance Metrics Table for Performance Assessment Record (PAR) – Sample Table

NOTE: The following is a sample QASP Metrics Table developed for a particular project. Names of the project property, personnel, and contract references have been changed for security purposes. The following is provided for sample purposes only and shall be modified for project-specific needs.

QASP Performance Metrics Table					
	Exceptional	Very Good	Satisfactory	Marginal	Unsatisfactory
PAR Category: Quality of Product or Service					
<i>Performance indicator: Document Reviews</i>					
<u>Draft</u> Plans and Reports	All contract-milestone documents approved as submitted	One or more documents or subplans were approved as submitted, but exceptions were noted. Resubmissions were not required.	One or more documents or subplans required revisions to be resubmitted for approval prior to proceeding. Resubmission of an entire document or subplan was not required.	One or more documents or subplans required revisions to be resubmitted for approval prior to proceeding. Resubmission of an entire document or subplan was required.	One or more documents or subplans did not comply with contract requirements, or one or more documents or subplans required more than one resubmission of the entire document or subplan prior to its approval.
<i>Performance indicator: Project Execution</i>					
Process Compliance	Zero Corrective Action Requests (CAR)	1-5 CARs for non-critical WP violations (no impact to overall cost and schedule resulting from the non-compliance)	6 or more CARS for non-critical violations (no impact to overall cost and schedule resulting from the non-compliance)	>1 CAR where non-compliance adversely impacted overall cost or schedule	Repeated non-compliance with WP requirements resulted in cost overruns or repeated schedule extensions

Table D-2. QASP Performance Metrics Table for Performance Assessment Record (PAR) – Sample Table

NOTE: The following is a sample QASP Metrics Table developed for a particular project. Names of the project property, personnel, and contract references have been changed for security purposes. The following is provided for sample purposes only and shall be modified for project-specific needs.

QASP Performance Metrics Table (Continued)					
	Exceptional	Very Good	Satisfactory	Marginal	Unsatisfactory
Quality Control	.25% QA failure rate, 80% or more QC measures/standards accepted, zero repetitive QC failures	.5% QA failure rate, 80% or more QC measures/standards accepted, one or more repetitive QC failures occurred	1% QA failure rate, less than 80% of QC measures/standards accepted, or, one or more non-repetitive QA failures occurred	.2% QA failure rate, 1-3 repetitive QA failures occurred	4% QA failure rate, >3 repetitive QA failures occurred
PAR Category: Schedule					
<i>Performance indicator: Timely completion of tasks</i>					
<u>Final</u> Work Plans and Reports, project milestones, T.O. invoices	All document submittals and task order milestones and invoices complete and approved by T.O. date, project closed out/final invoice approved ahead of schedule	Project closed out/final invoice approved ahead of schedule	project closed out/final invoice approved on T.O. date	Project closed out/final invoice approved within 30 calendar days after T.O. date.	Project closed out/final invoice approved more than 30 calendar days after T.O. date.
Monthly status reports accurate			Yes	If the contractor fails to meet the requirement some of the	No

Table D-2. QASP Performance Metrics Table for Performance Assessment Record (PAR) – Sample Table

NOTE: The following is a sample QASP Metrics Table developed for a particular project. Names of the project property, personnel, and contract references have been changed for security purposes. The following is provided for sample purposes only and shall be modified for project-specific needs.

QASP Performance Metrics Table (Continued)					
	Exceptional	Very Good	Satisfactory	Marginal	Unsatisfactory
				time and corrects the performance when required by the Contracting Officer.	
Delays to schedule caused by contractor or other causes identified, in writing, in a timely manner to apply acceptable corrective actions.			Yes	If the contractor fails to meet the requirement some of the time and corrects the performance when required by the Contracting Officer.	No
PAR Category: Cost Control					
<i>Performance indicator: No unauthorized cost overruns</i>					
Unauthorized cost overruns			No		Yes
Total Project Costs	Total contract invoices less than 70% of initial T.O. authorized amount	Total contract invoices greater than 70% but less than 90% of initial T.O. authorized amount	Total contract invoices between 90% and 100% of initial T.O. authorized amount	Total contract invoices greater than 100% but less than 110% of initial T.O. authorized amount	Total contract invoices greater than 110% or less than 120% of T.O. authorized amount

Table D-2. QASP Performance Metrics Table for Performance Assessment Record (PAR) –
Sample Table

NOTE: The following is a sample QASP Metrics Table developed for a particular project. Names of the project property, personnel, and contract references have been changed for security purposes. The following is provided for sample purposes only and shall be modified for project-specific needs.

QASP Performance Metrics Table (Continued)					
	Exceptional	Very Good	Satisfactory	Marginal	Unsatisfactory
<i>Performance indicator: Monthly cost report</i>					
Monthly cost reports accurate			Yes	If the contractor fails to meet the requirement some of the time and corrects the performance when required by the Contracting Officer.	No
<i>Performance indicator: Impacts to cost</i>					
Impacts caused by contractor or other causes identified, in writing, in a timely manner to apply acceptable corrective actions.			Yes	If the contractor fails to meet the requirement some of the time and corrects the performance when required by the Contracting Officer.	No

Table D-2. QASP Performance Metrics Table for Performance Assessment Record (PAR) – Sample Table

NOTE: The following is a sample QASP Metrics Table developed for a particular project. Names of the project property, personnel, and contract references have been changed for security purposes. The following is provided for sample purposes only and shall be modified for project-specific needs.

QASP Performance Metrics Table (Continued)					
	Exceptional	Very Good	Satisfactory	Marginal	Unsatisfactory
PAR Category: Business Relations					
<i>Performance indicator: Met contractual responsibilities</i>					
Corrective Actions taken were timely and effective (Refer to CARs issued to contractor)			Yes	If the contractor fails to meet the requirement some of the time and corrects the performance when required by the Contracting Officer.	No
<i>Performance indicator: Professional and Ethical Conduct</i>					
Meetings and correspondences with public, project delivery team and other stakeholders	Zero letters of reprimand, grievances, or formal complaints AND one or more unsolicited letters of commendation		Zero letters of reprimand, grievances, or formal complaints	One letter of reprimand, grievance or formal complaint that was resolved through negotiation	More than one letter of reprimand, grievance or formal complaint that were resolved through negotiation OR removal of one or more project personnel as a result of a letter of reprimand, grievance or formal complaint.

Table D-2. QASP Performance Metrics Table for Performance Assessment Record (PAR) –
Sample Table

NOTE: The following is a sample QASP Metrics Table developed for a particular project. Names of the project property, personnel, and contract references have been changed for security purposes. The following is provided for sample purposes only and shall be modified for project-specific needs.

QASP Performance Metrics Table (Continued)					
	Exceptional	Very Good	Satisfactory	Marginal	Unsatisfactory
<i>Performance indicator: Customer has overall satisfaction with work performed</i>					
Customer survey results for rating period	5.0-6.0	4.0-4.9	3.0-3.9	2.0-2.9	<2.0
<i>Performance indicator: Personnel responsive and cooperative</i>					
Key personnel responsive, and cooperative	Always		Most Times		Almost Never
PAR Category: Management of Key Personnel and Resources					
<i>Performance indicator: Personnel knowledgeable and effective in their areas of responsibility</i>					
Personnel assigned to tasks	All personnel proposed by contractor were assigned to project, some personnel were substituted by higher qualified individuals.		All personnel proposed by contractor were assigned to project, some personnel were substituted by equally qualified individuals.		All personnel proposed by contractor were assigned to project, some personnel were substituted by lesser qualified individuals.
<i>Performance indicator: Personnel able to manage resources efficiently</i>					
Instances when resource management had negative impact on project	0	1-2	3-4	5-6	>6

Table D-2. QASP Performance Metrics Table for Performance Assessment Record (PAR) – Sample Table

NOTE: The following is a sample QASP Metrics Table developed for a particular project. Names of the project property, personnel, and contract references have been changed for security purposes. The following is provided for sample purposes only and shall be modified for project-specific needs.

QASP Performance Metrics Table (Continued)					
	Exceptional	Very Good	Satisfactory	Marginal	Unsatisfactory
execution					
PAR Category: Safety					
<i>Performance indicator: Accidents and Violations</i>					
*Number of Class A Accidents, contractor at fault	0				1 or more
*Major safety violations	0		1		>1
*Minor safety violations	1		2-4		>4

*From Section C of Basic contract #A123BC-00-D-0000, Amendment 0001 (may be included but are not limited to these)

The following guidelines are provided for issuing ratings that are subjective in nature, these ratings will be supported by the weight of evidence documented during the government's surveillance efforts:

Exceptional: Performance *meets* contractual requirements and *exceeds many* to the Government's benefit. The contractual performance of the element or sub-element being assessed was accomplished with *few minor problems* for which corrective actions taken by the contractor were *highly effective*.

Very Good: Performance *meets* contractual requirements and *exceeds some* to the Government's benefit. The contractual performance of the element or sub-element being assessed was accomplished with *some minor problems* for which corrective actions taken by the contractor were *effective*.

Satisfactory: Performance *meets* contractual requirements. The contractual performance of the element or sub-element contains *some minor problems* for which corrective actions taken by the contractor *appear or were satisfactory*.

Marginal: Performance *does not meet all* contractual requirements. The contractual performance of the element or sub-element being assessed reflects a *serious problem* for which the contractor has *not yet identified corrective actions*. The contractor's proposed actions appear only *marginally effective or were not fully implemented*.

Unsatisfactory: Performance *does not meet most* contractual requirements and *recovery is not likely* in a timely manner. The contractual performance of the element or sub-element contains *serious problems* for which the contractor's corrective actions *appear or were ineffective*.

EM 1110-1-4009
15 Jun 07

This page intentionally left blank